

**REMARKS**

In response to the Restriction Requirement, applicant hereby elects Group I (claims 1-24 and 40-47) with traverse. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 25-30 of Group II should be included with the claims of Group I. Claim 1 of Group I may be more properly characterized as a subcombination of the claims of Group II. Moreover, there would be no "serious burden" on the Examiner if these Groups were combined. MPEP § 806.05(c). Applicant is puzzled by the Examiner's reliance on MPEP § 806.04 since no genus/species requirement has been made. In addition, MPEP § 808.01 requires that the Examiner provide more than simply asserting they have separate utility and then copying the claims language.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268006US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

7/13/07

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio  
Maurice J. PirioRegistration No.: 33,273  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-8000  
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant